

New York Tribune.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1912.

Owned and published daily by the Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Office: 151 Nassau street, New York. Telephone: 1234.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.
Daily and Sunday, one month, \$4.00
Daily and Sunday, six months, \$22.00
Daily and Sunday, one year, \$40.00
Daily only, one month, \$2.00
Daily only, six months, \$12.00
Daily only, one year, \$22.00
Sunday only, one month, \$1.00
Sunday only, six months, \$6.00
Sunday only, one year, \$12.00

Foreign subscriptions to all countries in the Universal Postal Union, including postage.
Daily and Sunday, one month, \$17.50
Daily and Sunday, six months, \$102.00
Daily and Sunday, one year, \$184.00
Daily only, one month, \$10.00
Daily only, six months, \$60.00
Daily only, one year, \$112.00

CANADIAN RATES.
Daily and Sunday, one month, \$10.00
Daily and Sunday, six months, \$60.00
Daily and Sunday, one year, \$112.00
Daily only, one month, \$6.00
Daily only, six months, \$36.00
Daily only, one year, \$68.00

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Our readers will confer a favor by advising us when they are unable to procure a copy of The Tribune from their regular dealer. Address: Tribune, Circulation Department.

UNIQUE AND ORIGINAL.
According to his own testimony Mr. Thomas F. Ryan was a Saul among the campaign contributors. He stood head and shoulders above all the rest, giving \$150,000 in 1904 to the Parker campaign, not with the hope of electing a Democratic President, but simply in order to enable the Democratic National Committee to preserve appearances. No more heroic hero to a lost cause has been brought to light by the disclosures of the Clapp investigating committee.

Mr. Ryan's theory of giving is also entitled to unique rank. He testified that in the course of the campaign for the Democratic Presidential nomination he gave between \$75,000 and \$80,000 to the Harmon fund and more than \$30,000 to the Underwood fund. Mr. Harmon and Mr. Underwood were supposed to be rivals for the nomination. At least they protested they were, and the managers of either, thinking his nomination probable, could not but have considered their principal's cause weakened by a large contribution to the efforts of a rival campaign committee from a source friendly to them. But Mr. Ryan's mind does not move along that kind of single track. He was just as willing to finance all the other candidates. "I was not asked to aid Mr. Clark or 'Mr. Wilson,'" he said, "but would have given them assistance if it had been requested."

Colonel Watterston was right when he told the Wilson managers last winter that if they applied to Mr. Ryan they would not come away empty handed. The Wilson people were suspicious of the colonel's tip and did not act upon it. How Speaker Clark's board of strategy failed to hear of and profit by Mr. Ryan's beneficent proclivities has not yet been set down as a veracious history.

The Ryan method of campaign giving, if carried to a logical conclusion, would make it easy to return to the simple life in political management. If he had contributed between \$50,000 and \$100,000 to all four of the leading Democratic candidates they would have been relatively no better off as regards their chances against one another than if he had refrained altogether from contributing. The money spent would have benefited those who spent it, but would really have helped no one of the candidates more than any other. It was "academic" spending, shooting in the air for the mere pleasure of shooting. It may be Mr. Ryan's subtle purpose to push the custom of political subscription to a *reductio ad absurdum*. If all givers were compelled to give equally to all candidates there would soon be no need of laws to restrain excessive campaign expenditures.

A GAP IN THE PROOF.
Mr. Bryan has written for a syndicate of newspapers a striking article on the advantages of limiting the tenure of the President to a single term. He has summarized the arguments which led him, as the power behind the throne at Baltimore, to insert in the Democratic national platform a declaration pledging the party and its Presidential candidate to the single term principle. He deserves credit for having done something—though not in the best way, for the single term should be lengthened to six years—to forward an important constitutional reform, and he undoubtedly expressed his own sincere conviction when he wrote the other day:

"The time is ripe, therefore, for an amendment to the Constitution which will strengthen our Presidents by removing the temptations that make them weak, and the Democratic party leads the way to this important change. It proposes to limit the President to a single term, so that when he takes his oath of office he will have nothing to fear him but the performance of his duties—no ambition but to make sure his place in history by fidelity to the public weal."

It would, however, greatly strengthen Mr. Bryan's assertion that "the Democratic party leads the way to this important change" if he could quote the Democratic candidate for President as favoring it. He cannot do that, even after the heart-to-heart and brother-to-brother communion which he recently had at Lincoln with Governor Wilson. The latter said in his speech of acceptance that "a platform is not a programme," and as the candidate of the Democratic party Mr. Wilson has thus far avoided committing himself to anything whatsoever in the national platform. The best that Mr. Bryan can do is to say: "Governor Wilson is pledged by his platform to a single term." But there remains the pertinent question, "Will he recognize the validity of a pledge made on his behalf about which he was not consulted and in which he was not personally believed?" It would be singular, if Mr. Wilson

really approved the single term theory, that he should refrain from expressing, even privately to Mr. Bryan, his satisfaction that the Democratic party had put him in a position, if elected, to set a new precedent in American politics by not only declining to be considered as a candidate for re-nomination but also actively working to secure a constitutional amendment making his re-nomination impossible. Why shouldn't he gladly lead in the direction in which the Democratic party claims to be leading?

Mr. Bryan seems himself at a loss to answer that question. Before he writes another article praising the activity of the Democratic party in ushering in a desirable constitutional reform he ought at least to get a few words of endorsement and sympathy from the Democratic nominee for President. If Mr. Wilson is against the single term, what will it have profited Mr. Bryan to have written a repudiated principle into a sidetracked platform?

LITTLE FALLS' BACK-DOWN.
Being prodded by Governor Dix, the Little Falls authorities permitted the Socialists to speak in the local park and nothing untoward happened. A lot of fiery words were spilled, but no blood was shed. In spite of all the authorities stupidly did to make the situation worse there was no rioting and no violence. Probably there is less chance of it now that the Socialists have had their say. The result shows how empty were the fears which the Mayor and Sheriff entertained of the danger of permitting the strikers to gather in public and listen to the Socialists. These officials have done at last under pressure of public opinion what if they had been sensible they would have done at first.

But the Governor and the Sheriff haven't settled the constitutional question between them. It is to be hoped when the case against Mayor Lunn for trying to speak without a permit comes up in court it will be carried far enough to obtain an authoritative ruling as to the control which local authorities have over gatherings in public streets and parks. The question whether strikers may hold such meetings as those attempted at Little Falls is going to arise again and again. It is necessary to find out whether the police may forbid them without violating the constitutional guarantee of free speech.

DISCREDITABLE "DUCKING."
Mr. Roosevelt never endorsed the reciprocity that Congress passed and President Taft signed. When, before anything had been done in the matter, the President mentioned the subject to the ex-President as a mere plan, Mr. Roosevelt approved the general idea. It was intimated to him by Mr. Taft that the sort of reciprocity Mr. Taft was going to give everybody Mr. Roosevelt did approve as an idea. The sort of reciprocity Mr. Taft worked out against the former as a fact Mr. Roosevelt did not approve. He has condemned it unsparringly. The New York Press.

The attempt of Mr. Roosevelt's followers to arouse feeling against Mr. Taft on account of Canadian reciprocity is one of the most discreditable features of their whole libellous campaign against him. The plea that Mr. Roosevelt was fooled into supporting an agreement and that he never approved the arrangement which was made is absolutely without foundation. Before entering into the agreement Mr. Taft consulted Mr. Roosevelt fully about the details of the pending negotiations and discussed its effect on agriculture and the objections which might be raised on the very grounds on which Mr. Roosevelt denounced it when he sought the votes of the border farmers. In reply, Mr. Roosevelt on January 12, 1911, wrote:

"Dear Mr. President: I at once took your letter and went over it with the 'Crick' and 'Crick.' It seems to me that what you propose to do with Canada is admirable from every standpoint. I firmly believe in free trade with Canada for both economic and political reasons. As you say, however, cost is substantially the same in the end, especially if you are simply justified by the platform. Whether Canada will accept such reciprocity I do not know, but it is greatly to your credit to make the effort. It may damage the Republican party for a while, but it will surely benefit the nation, and it will surely benefit the party, cotton, etc., as you propose."

But this was not all. If it were there might be some ground for saying that the approval was based on imperfect knowledge. The agreement was concluded pursuant to this advice and was submitted to Congress on January 23, 1911, and on that same day a summary of its provisions was published. An animated debate in and out of Congress followed, and every detail of duty changes became public property, and every objection to the measure, on the ground that it was unfair to the farmer and on other grounds, was brought forward. Yet, with all that information before him, knowing exactly what he was doing, on February 13, the very night before the measure was to come to a vote in the House, Mr. Roosevelt thus heartily commended it in a speech at the Republican Club:

"I want to say how glad I am to hear this day in which the club has tonight responded to the two appeals made to them to uphold the hands of President Taft, both in his efforts to secure reciprocity with Canada and in his effort to secure the fortification of the Panama Canal. And in addition to what has been said about reciprocity with Canada, I would like to make this point: It should always be a cardinal point in our foreign policy to establish the closest and most friendly relations of equal respect and advantage with our great neighbor to the north. And I had the reciprocity arrangement because it represents an effort to bring about a closer, a more intimate, a more friendly relationship of mutual advantage on equal terms between Canada and the United States."

Nor did Mr. Roosevelt stop there. Congress adjourned without action by the Senate. A special session was called, and after more debate, with the full provisions of the agreement before the public in both countries and with specific measures to carry it out before both Congress and the Ottawa Parliament, the House again passed the bill on April 21, 1911. In "The Saturday Evening Post" for April 22 was an authorized interview with Mr. Roosevelt

commending the agreement in the strongest terms.

To say that Mr. Roosevelt did not know what he was commending, but was strenuously fighting for a measure which had been before the world for months without thought or study, is at once to discredit his intelligence and his leadership. The Progressive campaigners should not make their leader ridiculous. Mr. Roosevelt's unsparring condemnation of the sort of reciprocity Mr. Taft worked out was reserved till long after the question was settled.

TOO MUCH FOR HIM.
So the colonel is reported to be having difficulty in "getting away with it" in the case of Mr. George W. Perkins and, worse still, even to entertain doubts of his ability to "get away with it."

But what is to become of the colonel, except of course as an historic character on account of his past services, if the veneration of his capacity for "getting away with it" shall disappear from the earth? By proving too great a weight even for the colonel to carry Mr. Perkins will make his fame secure. But it was bound to come. You can "get away with it" with all of the people all of the time, but you can't "get away with it" with all of the people all of the time, especially if you attempt to "get away with" Mr. George W. Perkins.

HIGHWAY BONDS.
Is the referendum bill to approve the issue of \$50,000,000 of state bonds for highway construction constitutional? This question has been raised by the secretary of the Board of Trade and Transportation because the state constitution, Section 12, Article VII, is taken as forbidding the issue of highway bonds in addition to the \$50,000,000 now authorized, when it says: "The aggregate of the debts authorized by this section shall not at any one time exceed the sum of \$50,000,000." The section containing these words is the one adopted in 1905 making special provision for the issue of highway construction bonds, and it is contended by those who say further borrowing is now impossible that this specific debt-limiting provision supercedes, so far as borrowing money for highway purposes is concerned, the general provisions of Section 4, Article VII.

This view appears to be mistaken. Section 4 of Article VII provides the regular way in which debts may be created by the state for various public purposes. It requires that debt-creating acts of the Legislature shall be approved by popular vote before taking effect. Section 12 provides for an exception to this general method in the case of highway bonds up to \$50,000,000. The Legislature is allowed to borrow \$50,000,000 without obtaining popular approval of the acts authorizing the bond issues. It empowers the Legislature to create a certain debt which the Legislature previously could not create without popular sanction. It limits the amount of debt which the Legislature acting independently can create. It does not take away from the Legislature any power which it formerly possessed with regard to creating debts. It merely confers additional power and limits that additional power.

The \$50,000,000 restriction on which reliance is placed by those who think additional borrowing for highways unconstitutional is not a restriction upon the amount that may be borrowed for highway construction, but a restriction on the amount that may be borrowed by the Legislature without a referendum of the debt-creating acts to the people. It limits, not the amount that may be raised, but the amount that may be raised in a special way. It limits the exemption which highway funds may enjoy from the operation of the general restrictions upon the creation of state debts. The very fact that there is a limit of \$50,000,000 to the funds which may be borrowed under Section 12 is proof positive that it was never intended to have this section supersede Section 4 as regards highway debts. The state never meant to leave itself, when that \$50,000,000 was authorized and the bonds had years to run, with no means of carrying on the work of highway construction.

THE TALK OF THE DAY.
Many of the statements in Sir Sidney Lee's much discussed Memoir of King Edward VII. are daily contradicted by Edward Legge, who writes in "The Fortnightly Review" on the late King's character and personality. The contradictions apply chiefly to the depreciation of the King's diplomacy and intellectual interests. Here is one of Mr. Legge's stories: "At Baden-Baden, in the old days, King Edward often used to make purchases at a certain shop and have long chats with the manager. Twice or thrice he said, 'When you happen to be in London come and see me.' The time arrived when the trader chanced to be in London on business. Muttering up all his courage, he left his card at Marlborough House, and the following day he received an invitation to spend three days at Sandringham. Thence, entering the room into which he was summoned, he was greeted most amiably by the prince, who presented him to 'my wife, the princess; my brother, the Duke of Edinburgh, and my brother's wife.'"

HIS GREATNESS.
He didn't climb the hills of fame. But kept the middle ground; On history's pages never his name. By any will be found. But he was brave and he was good, And through his life he ever stood Face front to every foe.

Go ask his wife if you would know "The record that he made." And to his little child, go Ask him how daddy played. And then go ask his neighbors, too, And hear them sing his praises. They'll tell you he was kind and true, That honor marked his ways.

Greatness is not by numbers told, Nor always written down On history's pages, all that's gold Goes not into a crown. Go ask the great who day by day Are cheerful, kind and true, And give their best along life's way Of service to the few.

Men who purchase small country weekly newspapers not infrequently have a desire to roll up their sleeves and do the work. Such a man, a Scotchman, was recently mentioned by E. W. Miller, of Ottawa, Ill., when a crowd of writers were relating experiences they had had. This man, according to Mr. Miller, turned to the managing editor—who went down to the editorial room at 5 o'clock every morning, by the way, wrote out the assignments for the day and then went out to cover them—and said he had noticed a column of "wee bit jokes" in other papers, and thought it would be well if his new paper carried such a column. "But where," he asked, "can I get a man to write 'em?" The managing editor suggested that the owner, being Scotch, write such a column himself. "Ah," said the owner, "I ken I'm a bit brack o' the pen. I can write up the wee bit birth notices, and the wee bit deaths, and the wee bit marriages, but the wee bit joke-mon, that's dif-fer-ent. I can write bonny, but I jokin' w' great decency."

THE DEBTS OF THE FIGHTERS.
The Balkan war affords another striking illustration of the paradox that while money is proverbially the "sneaks of war," lack of it never restrains nations which want to fight. At least four of the five present belligerents have for years been "spoiling for a fight," and now they are actually at it, and yet they are all in poor financial condition and largely dependent upon other nations for loans.

The fiscal tribulations of Turkey have been a byword of the world for many years, and she is by no means free from them now, although she has made progress in that direction. Her foreign indebtedness amounts to nearly \$350,000,000, nearly all of it at 4 per cent interest, and all of it except a small fraction recently quoted on the market below par—from 90 down to 77. Bulgaria has bonds amounting to nearly \$82,000,000, at 6, 5 and 4½ per cent interest, and ranging on the market before the war began at from 88 down to 85. It is interesting to observe that Bulgarian 6's rank below Turkish 4's. Serbia owes about \$60,000,000, on which she pays 4 per cent, and her bonds were recently quoted at 83. Montenegro has foreign obligations of only \$1,250,000, incurred less than three years ago, at 4 per cent. A few months ago they were quoted at 92, but since Montenegro began fighting Turkey they have fallen to 87.5. Greece has foreign debts of nearly \$162,500,000, at 2.5, 4 and 5 per cent, recently quoted at from 98 down to 43.

In these circumstances the possibility of securing further loans for the prosecution of the war becomes a highly interesting topic of speculation. It seems certain that more money will be needed by all the fighters, if the war continues and is developed to any considerable extent. The great powers could probably prevent them from getting it in the European money market, if they saw fit so to do; and it would

be quite logical for them, after declaring in advance their strong disapproval of any breach of the peace, to refuse the means for waging war. Yet it is not a common thing thus to shut up sources of supply, and it will not be surprising if the battling states find somewhere all the funds they need for maintaining their armies in the field until the conflict reaches a military conclusion.

Mr. Sulzer is now going to give the state a good look at the man who, as Speaker, was helped by "that great statesman, Richard Croker," and as Governor expects to be helped by that other great statesman, Charles F. Murphy.

Talking about "angels" in the pecuniary sense, what's the matter with Thomas F. Ryan? And most of it, too, just for the honor of the party in a campaign which he knew was already lost! No, not a mere angel, but an archangel.

The Greeks accuse the Turks of using typhoid and cholera germs as munitions of war, and the Turks charge the Montenegrins with using dumdum bullets. It will probably be judicious to believe neither.

If Hiram Johnson fills all of Colonel Roosevelt's speaking engagements for the rest of the campaign it is to be hoped that he will mend the oratorical manners which he recently displayed; else there will be "too much Johnson" with a vengeance.

The carrier pigeons which have just flown from Niagara Falls to New York in from six and a half to seven hours remind ambitious aviators that all their aeroplanes have not yet made this a birdless age.

"I am a progressive," says Judge Parker. Ryan believed in his progressiveness to the extent of \$450,000.

A comet has been discovered. Evidently trying to maintain the reputation of comets for coming in years of war and trouble.

The death of W. B. Heyburn has given an opportunity to appoint a United States Senator to a Democratic Governor of a Republican state. The same situation arose recently in Maine and in North Dakota. It might arise also in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Oregon, in which states there are Democratic Governors and Republican legislatures.

A "tag day" for charity is bad enough, but a "tag day" for political purposes would be unendurable. Mayor Gaynor is right in protesting citizens against annoyance and fund solicitors against manifestations of public resentment.

Governor Wilson does himself injustice in saying that before his recent tours he was "comparatively unknown" to the people of the country. Was his absenteeism from New Jersey last year all in vain? Did not his persistent "swinging round the circle" and haranguing the multitudes acquaint the people with his personality? If not, it is to be feared that they never could get acquainted with him.

THE TALK OF THE DAY.
Many of the statements in Sir Sidney Lee's much discussed Memoir of King Edward VII. are daily contradicted by Edward Legge, who writes in "The Fortnightly Review" on the late King's character and personality. The contradictions apply chiefly to the depreciation of the King's diplomacy and intellectual interests. Here is one of Mr. Legge's stories: "At Baden-Baden, in the old days, King Edward often used to make purchases at a certain shop and have long chats with the manager. Twice or thrice he said, 'When you happen to be in London come and see me.' The time arrived when the trader chanced to be in London on business. Muttering up all his courage, he left his card at Marlborough House, and the following day he received an invitation to spend three days at Sandringham. Thence, entering the room into which he was summoned, he was greeted most amiably by the prince, who presented him to 'my wife, the princess; my brother, the Duke of Edinburgh, and my brother's wife.'"

HIS GREATNESS.
He didn't climb the hills of fame. But kept the middle ground; On history's pages never his name. By any will be found. But he was brave and he was good, And through his life he ever stood Face front to every foe.

Go ask his wife if you would know "The record that he made." And to his little child, go Ask him how daddy played. And then go ask his neighbors, too, And hear them sing his praises. They'll tell you he was kind and true, That honor marked his ways.

Greatness is not by numbers told, Nor always written down On history's pages, all that's gold Goes not into a crown. Go ask the great who day by day Are cheerful, kind and true, And give their best along life's way Of service to the few.

Men who purchase small country weekly newspapers not infrequently have a desire to roll up their sleeves and do the work. Such a man, a Scotchman, was recently mentioned by E. W. Miller, of Ottawa, Ill., when a crowd of writers were relating experiences they had had. This man, according to Mr. Miller, turned to the managing editor—who went down to the editorial room at 5 o'clock every morning, by the way, wrote out the assignments for the day and then went out to cover them—and said he had noticed a column of "wee bit jokes" in other papers, and thought it would be well if his new paper carried such a column. "But where," he asked, "can I get a man to write 'em?" The managing editor suggested that the owner, being Scotch, write such a column himself. "Ah," said the owner, "I ken I'm a bit brack o' the pen. I can write up the wee bit birth notices, and the wee bit deaths, and the wee bit marriages, but the wee bit joke-mon, that's dif-fer-ent. I can write bonny, but I jokin' w' great decency."

THE DEBTS OF THE FIGHTERS.
The Balkan war affords another striking illustration of the paradox that while money is proverbially the "sneaks of war," lack of it never restrains nations which want to fight. At least four of the five present belligerents have for years been "spoiling for a fight," and now they are actually at it, and yet they are all in poor financial condition and largely dependent upon other nations for loans.

The fiscal tribulations of Turkey have been a byword of the world for many years, and she is by no means free from them now, although she has made progress in that direction. Her foreign indebtedness amounts to nearly \$350,000,000, nearly all of it at 4 per cent interest, and all of it except a small fraction recently quoted on the market below par—from 90 down to 77. Bulgaria has bonds amounting to nearly \$82,000,000, at 6, 5 and 4½ per cent interest, and ranging on the market before the war began at from 88 down to 85. It is interesting to observe that Bulgarian 6's rank below Turkish 4's. Serbia owes about \$60,000,000, on which she pays 4 per cent, and her bonds were recently quoted at 83. Montenegro has foreign obligations of only \$1,250,000, incurred less than three years ago, at 4 per cent. A few months ago they were quoted at 92, but since Montenegro began fighting Turkey they have fallen to 87.5. Greece has foreign debts of nearly \$162,500,000, at 2.5, 4 and 5 per cent, recently quoted at from 98 down to 43.

In these circumstances the possibility of securing further loans for the prosecution of the war becomes a highly interesting topic of speculation. It seems certain that more money will be needed by all the fighters, if the war continues and is developed to any considerable extent. The great powers could probably prevent them from getting it in the European money market, if they saw fit so to do; and it would

be quite logical for them, after declaring in advance their strong disapproval of any breach of the peace, to refuse the means for waging war. Yet it is not a common thing thus to shut up sources of supply, and it will not be surprising if the battling states find somewhere all the funds they need for maintaining their armies in the field until the conflict reaches a military conclusion.

Mr. Sulzer is now going to give the state a good look at the man who, as Speaker, was helped by "that great statesman, Richard Croker," and as Governor expects to be helped by that other great statesman, Charles F. Murphy.

Talking about "angels" in the pecuniary sense, what's the matter with Thomas F. Ryan? And most of it, too, just for the honor of the party in a campaign which he knew was already lost! No, not a mere angel, but an archangel.

The Greeks accuse the Turks of using typhoid and cholera germs as munitions of war, and the Turks charge the Montenegrins with using dumdum bullets. It will probably be judicious to believe neither.

If Hiram Johnson fills all of Colonel Roosevelt's speaking engagements for the rest of the campaign it is to be hoped that he will mend the oratorical manners which he recently displayed; else there will be "too much Johnson" with a vengeance.

The carrier pigeons which have just flown from Niagara Falls to New York in from six and a half to seven hours remind ambitious aviators that all their aeroplanes have not yet made this a birdless age.

"I am a progressive," says Judge Parker. Ryan believed in his progressiveness to the extent of \$450,000.

A comet has been discovered. Evidently trying to maintain the reputation of comets for coming in years of war and trouble.

The death of W. B. Heyburn has given an opportunity to appoint a United States Senator to a Democratic Governor of a Republican state. The same situation arose recently in Maine and in North Dakota. It might arise also in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Oregon, in which states there are Democratic Governors and Republican legislatures.

A "tag day" for charity is bad enough, but a "tag day" for political purposes would be unendurable. Mayor Gaynor is right in protesting citizens against annoyance and fund solicitors against manifestations of public resentment.

than he really was lost a good position. He has applied at hundreds of places since then, but "we will take your address and let you know" was until yesterday the best result. He lives with his wife and two children in an apartment house, and on opening his door to go on the daily, almost hopeless, hunt for work he met the man who occupies an apartment on the same floor, but to whom he had never spoken. "I don't know whether it was the Becker trial or Roosevelt or the weather," said the work seeker, "but we got talking about something and presently I told my hard luck story. My neighbor gave me a hint, followed me with a good word and now I am in the same business house where I have been employed. Funny! I looked all over for work and found it next door in a Harlem flat."

"Good gracious, you don't dare to send out all that abuse of the candidate, do you?"

"Sure, I do. It's all understood between us. I give the abuse and he gets the advertising."—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

PROGRESS AND CHANGE
Neither Implies the Other, and a New Party Does Not Mean Utopia.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: "Progressive" is a common enough word, in general use, to convey a meaning of moving forward, improving. It being the common desire and effort of civilized mankind to progress, the adoption of the term "Progressive" as the title of a political party was a clever and direct appeal to the imagination and sympathy. The self-styled Progressive party proposes many changes, but it is manifest that change is not, as a matter of course, progress; it may be quite the contrary. Real progress is probably more a matter of growth than of pronounced change.

The policy of the Progressive party is "change." They would first reform the political machinery of the country by changing from Republican and Democratic bosses to Progressive bosses. Then they would change the Constitution; they would change the laws regulating big business; they would change the opportunities of life so that those who have failed under old conditions may succeed under those promised. What an alluring promise! And because the Republicans decline to subscribe to these changes on the ground that they are not truly progressive, practical and helpful, they are contemptuously dubbed non-progressive, "stand-patters."

The great promise, upon which the Progressives rely for popular favor in their plans to undertake the rehabilitation of our unfortunate country, is that "the people shall rule." The common impression seems to have been that the people of this country always have ruled; the common sense and good judgment of the American people are proverbial and have met and properly settled every problem which has been presented. But we are now told that we must change; that only in change lies progress. We must lay aside the poor old Constitution, which has been the admiration of the world and the model for others, and we must substitute for it the will of the majority—the arbitrary, the unstable will, the will for the time being—whether intelligent or influenced chiefly by a momentary frenzy.

A most important change to secure the direct rule of the people, which is to cure the ills on which we are said to be suffering, is the initiative, referendum and recall. But in his speech of acceptance the Progressive nominee has this to say: "To use such measures as the initiative, referendum and recall indiscriminately and promiscuously on all kinds of occasions would undoubtedly cause disaster." Of course, Mr. Roosevelt expects to constitute in himself the discretion which shall apply these remedies, so that the disaster may not eventuate. The whole talk about restoring the rule of the people is an offence to the intelligence and patriotism of the voters of this country.

Against the changes which the new party proposes the voters will weigh the facts of progress and prosperity which the country has experienced under the Constitution, the Republican party and the protective tariff—experience against experiment.

F. LEWIS ANDERSON.
New York, Oct. 14, 1912.

RIGHT OF FREE SPEECH
Is It Only a Pleasant Little Fiction with Which We Tickle Our Fancy?

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The right to freedom of speech is one of the guarantees of the Constitution which was so dearly won, and which we Americans have always prided ourselves was the inalienable right of every citizen. Your news columns have recorded a number of recent instances of the denial of free speech by officials in various parts of the country. The happenings at Little Falls, N. Y., again call attention to the growing tendency to disregard this fundamental right. The Tribune has always fought any encroachments on our constitutional rights, and I am sure you will uphold them in this instance.

Here is the Mayor of Schenectady addressing an audience of about forty people in broad daylight, not on a busy thoroughfare, where traffic might be obstructed, but in a park, where the night before the Bull Moosers had held forth. The police order Mayor Lunn to stop speaking, although there is no sign of disorder and no apparent excuse for the intrusion. Because Mr. Lunn quotes the Constitution and defends his right to speak he is arrested and dragged to a dirty jail. Another Socialist, an ex-clergyman, while reading from the Bible at a park meeting is also arrested for no reason whatever except his political beliefs.

It is just such incidents as these that create lawlessness. Other officials, seeing how little ad there is in the press when such things occur, are emboldened to use similar methods in silencing those who oppose their views, or at the dictation of a few powerful men. A fundamental right of a law-abiding citizen—the Mayor of a large city—is being viciously attacked. But this is only one of a number of similar occurrences which have received but little attention. These outrages should call forth a strong protest from every lover of freedom and American democracy. It should be impossible in this day to question a man's right to free speech. We must affirm our faith in those constitutional guarantees which, we claim, make this the land of the free.

"They have rights who dare maintain them."
J. D. MACKENZIE.
New York, Oct. 15, 1912.

WILSON AND THE CHINESE.
To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I am a daily reader of The Tribune and do wish that it would copy from Woodrow Wilson's book an article showing his love for the foreign population when he said that the Chinese were the most desirable immigrants we had, or words to that effect. Representative Rodenburg, of Illinois, I think, called attention to it.

"CONSTANT READER."
Hartford, Conn., Oct. 17, 1912.

People and Social Incidents

NEW YORK SOCIETY.

Mr. and Mrs. C. Oliver Iselin are due to arrive in New York to-day from Europe. They will be at the St. Regis for a short stay before going to their place at Alken, S. C.

Commodore and Mrs. Elbridge T. Gerry are booked to sail from England for New York to-morrow. They went abroad early in September, after spending the summer at Newport.

Miss Isabel Atterbury, daughter of Mrs. Lewis B. Atterbury, will be married on December 4 to Le Roy Miller.

Count von Bernstorff, the German Ambassador in Washington, and the Countess von Bernstorff are due to arrive in New York to-day on the Kaiserin Augusta Victoria.

Mr. and Mrs. Newbold Edgar have returned to the city from Southampton, Long Island, where they spent the summer, and are at the Hotel Belmont.

General Sir John French has returned to the city from the West and is at the Ritz-Carlton.

Mr. and Mrs. Stuart Duncan will come to town at the end of the month from Newport. Mrs. Duncan returned from Europe a fortnight ago, after spending six weeks abroad.

Mr. and Mrs. William H. Falconer have returned to the city from Lake Mohonk and are at their house, No. 701 Madison avenue.

Mr. and Mrs. M. Orme Wilson are due to arrive in New York to-day on the Kaiser Wilhelm der Grosse.

Mrs. Herman B. Duryea, who has been abroad throughout the summer, will arrive in New York to-day on board the Kaiserin Augusta Victoria.

Mr. and Mrs. W. A. Slayback left town yesterday for Pasadena, Cal.

Mr. and Mrs. William H. Tew have returned to the city for the winter from Westbury, Long Island.

Mrs. Adair sailed from England for New York